Perfect formulation of the futures opening auction problem

Johannes C. Müller[a⋆], Sebastian Pokutta[b] and Alexander Martin[a],
Susanne Pape[a], Andrea Peter[a] and Thomas Winter[c]

[a] *Department of Mathematics, FAU Erlangen-Nürnberg, Cauerstr. 11, D-91058 Erlangen, Germany;*
[b] *ISyE, Georgia Institute of Technology, Groseclose 0205, 765 Ferst Dr, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA;*
[c] *Eurex Frankfurt AG, D-60485 Frankfurt, Germany*

(Preprint 2015-03-31)

arXiv:1404.6546v2 [math.OC] 31 Mar 2015

ABSTRACT. Futures contracts are an important tool to mitigate market risk and counterparty credit risk. In futures markets these contracts can be traded with varying expiration dates and underlyings. A common hedging strategy is to roll positions forward into the next expiration date, however this strategy comes with significant rollover risk both in terms of the time spread risk but also operational risk. To address the latter, exchanges started to offer so-called *futures contract combinations*, which allow the traders for swapping two futures contracts with different expiration dates (*time spread trade*) or for swapping two futures contracts with different underlyings (*inter-product spread trade*). In theory, the price is in both cases the difference of the two involved futures contracts. However, in particular in the opening auctions price inefficiencies often occur due to suboptimal clearing, leading to potential arbitrage opportunities.

We present a minimum cost flow formulation of the futures opening auction problem that guarantees consistent prices. The core ideas are to model orders as arcs in a network, to enforce the equilibrium conditions with the help of two hierarchical objectives, and to combine these objectives into a single weighted objective while preserving the price information of dual optimal solutions. The resulting optimization problem can be solved in polynomial time and computational tests establish an empirical performance suitable for production environments.

1. INTRODUCTION

Futures contracts are some of the most liquid derivatives and, among other purposes, are an integral component of many hedging and risk mitigation strategies. For example, airlines regularly use futures to hedge against volatile crude prices and lock-in the current price level. These hedging strategies usually involve a rollover of the contracts from one expiration date (also called maturity) into the next when approaching the expiration date of the first. However, rolling the contracts forwards is not without risk, the so-called rollover risk. This risk consists of basically two components. The first component is the *time spread risk* (also called *calendar spread risk*), which is affected by whether the price difference between the maturing contract and the replacement contract with the extended expiration date matches the theoretical fair value. The other component, the *slippage*, is of an operational risk type. It is the risk of loss arising from selling off the old contracts and buying the new contracts being not perfectly simultaneous allowing for adversarial intermediate price moves or in an opening auction only one of the two orders begin executed; we refer the interested reader e.g., to (Hull, 2006; Cooper, 2015) for a discussion. While the time spread risk is market inherent and hence exchange unspecific, slippage can be mitigated by the exchange by offering futures swap products, so-called *combinations* and various futures exchanges, such as e.g., EUREX (European Exchange AG) offer such products. Offering however such products improves market transparency and liquidity only if those products are consistently priced and while this is ensured by arbitrageurs

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 90C33; 90C29; 90C05; 90C35; 91B26.

Key words and phrases. equilibrium problems; hierarchical objectives; linear programming; network flows; combinatorial auctions; futures exchanges.

Several of the presented results are taken from the Ph.D. thesis of J. C. Müller (2014).

⋆*Corresponding author.* Email: Johannes.Mueller@fau.de

intraday, this is not necessarily the case for the opening auction when the market opens. In fact, it has been observed that in the opening auctions in some cases prices across products are inconsistent, creating potential arbitrage opportunities.

We present an efficient optimization model that guarantees consistent prices at the end of the opening auction while maximizing economic surplus. We further demonstrate that the model can be solved extremely fast in practice for large amounts of contracts and contract types making it a prime candidate for production environments. The presented model is motivated by the product offering of EUREX, however it applies readily to various other futures exchanges.

Our terminology is standard as to be found e.g., in Hull (2006). We briefly recall the formal definition of a futures contract.

Definition 1. *A* futures contract *is an agreement between two parties to*

(1) *buy or sell an asset*
(2) *at an agreed-upon time in the future*
(3) *for an agreed-upon price.*

In the following, for brevity we will also refer to futures contracts simply as *contracts*. Futures contracts are typically traded on a daily basis on futures exchanges, where the trade prices are determined by an auction mechanism. In our auction mechanism, we distinguish futures contracts only by the underlying asset and expiration date. In particular, two futures contracts are equal if underlyings and expiration date are identical. Similarly, we define:

Definition 2. *A* futures contract combination *(short:* combination*) allows for swapping one futures contract for another futures contract.*

We will be concerned with two special cases of futures contract combinations:

Definition 3. *A* time spread trade *allows for swapping two futures contracts with the same underlying but with different expiration dates. An* inter-product spread trade *allows for swapping two futures contracts with different underlyings but not necessarily different expiration dates.*

Our opening auction model follows the one that is currently employed by EUREX and many other exchanges follow a similar setup, so that our setup can be readily applied. In the opening auction there are two different order types: limit orders and market orders. If a participant submits a *limit order*, then he or she has to specify the product to be bought or sold, the quantity, and the limit price. The *limit price* specifies the highest price per unit a buyer is willing to pay or the lowest price per unit a seller is willing to accept. If a participant submits a *market order*, then he or she has to specify product and quantity that is to be bought or sold. Market orders have a higher priority than limit orders and the trader is accepting all prices. In an opening auction a market order can be treated as a limit order with the highest feasible limit price if it is a buy order, or the lowest feasible limit price if it is a sell order; therefore, we do not need to model them explicitly and in the following all orders are of limit type.

We would also like to mention that a *partial execution* of limit orders or market orders is feasible if the limit price coincides with the market clearing price. *Fractional partial executions* are infeasible, as contracts are indivisible; therefore, a partial execution must trade an integral number of contracts. For the sake of completeness, we want to mention that the *fill-or-kill* order type, which must either be executed entirely or not executed at all, is not available in the opening auction.

1.1. **Related work.** The futures opening auction is a combinatorial auction and there exists a large body of work studying this type of auctions; we refer the interested reader to the very nice survey of de Vries & Vohra (2003) for an introduction. It is well-known that various combinatorial auctions can be solved in polynomial time provided, e.g., the constraint matrix is *total unimodular* and the right-hand side of the clearing program is integral. As we will see later, our setup admits such an efficient formulation via a network flow formulation resulting in a linear program for clearing with a totally unimodular constraint matrix.

Closely related to our work is the work of Winter et al. (2011), which is based on the master's thesis of M. Rudel. The authors developed a pure linear integer program to solve the problem for at most three futures contract types. The approach heavily relies on preprocessing techniques to

reduce the problem size for the three contracts case and while the underlying formulation is based on a network flow problem with orders modeled as arcs this structure is not exploited. In fact, the employed model is heavily driven by price conditions that involve binary variables as well as binary variables to enforce a terminal bid-ask spread to maximize economic surplus rendering the underlying structure inaccessible and natural market equilibrium conditions via duality cannot be exploited. Our approach is highly superior as we naturally observe market equilibria conditions from the dual linear program as well as ensure volume maximization by appropriate objective function regularization. We provide a comparison of both approaches in Section 4.2.

There is also a significant amount of literature on so-called *linear prices*, which are also referred to as *uniform prices*. In the absence of binary variables the dual variables of the clearing condition provide us with linear prices if we maximize the economic surplus. In previous work (Martin, Müller & Pokutta, 2014) we used this property to ensure the existence of linear prices in European day-ahead electricity auctions. In this work, however, we exploit this property in order to get a computationally advantageous model formulation.

1.2. **Contribution.** We provide a natural formulation for the futures opening auction problem and show that the problem can be formulated as a min cost flow problem. The price conditions of limit orders for contracts and contract combinations can be introduced into the model by choosing the right objective function. To the best of our knowledge previous authors were not aware of the existence of such an objective function that automatically yields the desired equilibrium conditions: uncrossing the order books, ensuring absence of combinatorial matching cycles, and certifying a bid-ask spread.

This new formulation has two major advantages. On the one hand, the model is solvable in polynomial time with a standard solver and the numerical results indicate that the computing times are sufficiently fast enough for the use in production environments. In particular, the algorithm is about 193 times faster than the approach presented by Winter et al. (2011). On the other hand, the model is very flexible: in contrast to previous models it is not restricted to a limited number of different contracts. The model is even capable to solve the opening auction problem for contracts with several different underlyings simultaneously. Moreover, the obtained prices are of high quality, that is, at any time the prices for contracts are consistent with the prices for combinations.

Another important advantage of our integrated model is that the economic surplus of *all participants* is maximized, i.e., it is not possible to find a solution with a higher economic surplus. In particular, our algorithm is superior to the current algorithm at EUREX which does not guarantee maximized economic surplus. In fact, the currently employed algorithm first determines prices for each contract separately, without taking combination orders into account. At that time the prices can therefore be inconsistent in reference to the crossed order books of combination orders. Nevertheless, the combination orders get triggered according to the prices of the underlying contracts and thus the market is not necessarily in a maximized surplus situation.

2. Preliminaries

Let T be the set of the different contracts in a futures opening auction. Hereinafter T is also referred to as the *contract set*. Remember that a contract is characterized by its underlying asset and its expiration date. Two contracts are equal if they have the same underlying asset and the same expiration date. Let the contract set be a *totally ordered set* sorted in ascending order, where the first sort criterion is the underlying asset id and the second criterion is the expiration date.

The main idea of the model is to treat the contracts as nodes in a graph and to treat the orders as directed arcs connecting the nodes. To be able to model all trading products we need to introduce a *super node* $\circ$ that represents the source or sink of futures products that only involve a single futures contract. Let $T' = T \cup \{\circ\}$ be the extended node set (contract set), where $\circ$ is appended to the end of the sorted set. Then the set of trading products C is a subset of arcs in $T' \times T'$. The arc $(r,s) \in T' \times T'$ represents the product "*demand contract r and offer contract s*".

Definition 4. *The product (r,s) is a* buy product *if $r < s$. If $r > s$, then it is a* sell product. *The case $r = s$ is not allowed. Per definition $r < \circ$ for all $r \in T$.*

The basic futures products are denoted as follows:

$(r,\circ) \in C$	*buy contract* r: demand contract r
$(\circ,s) \in C$	*sell contract* s: offer contract s
$(r,s) \in C$ with $r < s$	*buy combination* r,s: demand contract r and offer contract s
$(s,r) \in C$ with $r < s$	*sell combination* r,s: demand contract s and offer contract r.

Remark. *The super node* $\circ$ *is only used to visualize products and orders in a graph. We will omit it in the LP representation of the network flow model, as the flow conservation equation of the super node is a redundant equation and is a source of degeneracy in the dual LP.*

The set of limit orders (and market orders) is denoted by I and hereinafter also referred to as the *order book*. To model an order $i \in I$ we use the parameters $Q_{i,t}$ and $p_{i,t}$ with $t \in T$. The parameter $Q_{i,t}$ is the t-th entry of the characteristic vector $Q_i \in \{-1,0,1\}^T$ of the futures product associated with order i and $p_{i,t}$ is the t-th entry of a price vector $p_i \in \mathbb{Z}^T$ that represents the limit price of order i. If (r,s) is the product associated with i and $t = \min\{r,s\}$ is the smallest index, then the price vector p_i vanishes at the entries $T \setminus \{t\}$ and the entry $p_{i,t}$ is the limit price of order i. The execution state of order i is represented by a non-negative integer variable δ_i.

In other words, let (r,s) be the product associated with order $i \in I$, then the input parameters are filled as follows: for all $t \in T$

$$Q_{i,t} \in \{-1,0,1\} \qquad Q_{i,t} = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } t = r \text{ (demand contract } r) \\ -1 & \text{if } t = s \text{ (offer contract } s) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$p_{i,t} \in \mathbb{Z} \qquad p_{i,t} = \begin{cases} \text{limit price of order } i & \text{if } t = \min\{r,s\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\overline{\delta}_i \in \mathbb{N}_+ \qquad \overline{\delta}_i = \text{ maximal demanded/offered quantity of order } i.$$

And the solution variables are interpreted as follows:

$$\delta_i \in [0,\overline{\delta}_i] \cap \mathbb{Z} \qquad \delta_i = \begin{cases} \overline{\delta}_i & i \text{ is completely executed} \\ \text{otherwise} & i \text{ is partially executed} \\ 0 & i \text{ is not executed} \end{cases}$$

$$\pi_t \in \mathbb{Z} \qquad \pi_t = \text{market clearing price per unit for contract } t \in T.$$

Note that the market clearing price for combinations is given by the difference of the prices of the two underlying contracts; therefore, it is not necessary to model them explicitly.

Example 5. Assume that there are three different contracts $T = \{1,2,3\}$. An order $i \in I$ for the product $(1,\circ)$ (buy contract 1) with limit price 40 is modeled as follows:

$$Q_i = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top \qquad p_i = \begin{pmatrix} 40 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top.$$

And an order $j \in I$ for the product $(\circ,2)$ (sell contract 2) with limit price 53 is characterized by

$$Q_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top \qquad p_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 53 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top.$$

Whereas an order $k \in I$ for the product $(1,2)$ (buy combination 1,2 = buy contract 1 and sell contract 2) with a minimal spread of at least 13 currency units is modeled by directly involving the minimal spread

$$Q_k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top \qquad p_k = \begin{pmatrix} -13 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top.$$

Alternatively we can also use reference prices for the two underlying contracts

$$Q_k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top \qquad p_k = \begin{pmatrix} 40 & 53 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^\top.$$

The negative limit price indicates that the buyer wants to receive at least 13 currency units.

Observe that if we model a single buy or sell order, then the quantity vector and the price vector vanish at all but one entry. If we model a combination order, being a linear combination of a single buy and a single sell order, then the quantity vector vanishes at all but two entries. As order k is a linear combination of order i and j, we can write $Q_i + Q_j = Q_k$ and $p_i + p_j = p_k$.

3. Derivation of an hierarchical min cost flow model

We will first present a complete model that covers all market requirements and guarantees consistent prices. The objective is the maximization of the executed volume subject to the price constraints given by the limit prices of all limit orders.

$$\max \quad \sum_{i\in I} \delta_i \tag{MIP}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \forall t \in T \qquad \sum_{i\in I} Q_{i,t}\delta_i = 0 \qquad \text{clearing constraint} \tag{1}$$

$$\forall i \in I \qquad \delta_i > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{t\in T} (p_{i,t} - \pi_t) Q_{i,t} \geq 0 \qquad \text{price condition} \tag{2}$$

$$\forall i \in I \qquad \delta_i < \overline{\delta}_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{t\in T} (p_{i,t} - \pi_t) Q_{i,t} \leq 0 \qquad \text{price condition} \tag{3}$$

$$\forall i \in I \qquad 0 \leq \delta_i \leq \overline{\delta}_i \qquad \text{quantity restriction} \tag{4}$$

$$\forall i \in I \qquad \delta_i \in \mathbb{Z} \qquad \text{integrality condition} \tag{5}$$

$$\forall t \in T \qquad \pi_t \in \mathbb{Z} \qquad \text{price variable} \tag{6}$$

The price conditions (2) and (3) are so-called *indicator constraints*, which can be modeled with linear constraints by using big-M formulations. Later we will see that it is not necessary to model them explicitly as they can be enforced implicitly.

To solve this problem we analyze a relaxation of (MIP). The integrality of the execution variables δ is relaxed, as well as the price conditions are relaxed. We also replace the objective function so that we maximize the economic surplus of all participants instead of the execution volume.

$$\max \quad \sum_{i\in I} \delta_i \sum_{t\in T} p_{i,t} Q_{i,t} \tag{LP1}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad [\pi] \quad \forall t \in T \qquad \sum_{i\in I} Q_{i,t}\delta_i = 0 \qquad \text{clearing constraint}$$

$$[\overline{\nu}] \quad \forall i \in I \qquad \delta_i \leq \overline{\delta}_i \qquad \text{quantity restriction}$$

$$[\underline{\nu}] \quad \forall i \in I \qquad -\delta_i \leq 0 \qquad \text{quantity restriction}$$

The variables in square brackets denote the dual variables of the corresponding primal constraints. In the following, we show that if (LP1) is feasible, there exists an integral primal optimal solution δ^* and a dual optimal solution $(\pi^*, \overline{\nu}^*, \underline{\nu}^*)$ to (LP1). The vector π^* is called a *linear* or *uniform price vector* and the tuple (δ^*, π^*) is called a *competitive equilibrium* (cf. Arrow & Debreu (1954); Mas-Colell et al. (1995) or (Müller, 2014, Thm. 2.17)). Furthermore, we will show that an integral primal-dual feasible solution pair to (LP1) is optimal if and only if it is feasible for (MIP).

Recall that a matrix A of integers is *totally unimodular* if and only if for all vectors b, b', c, c', whose components are integers or $\pm\infty$, every minimal face of the polyhedron $\{x | b \leq Ax \leq b' \text{ and } c \leq x \leq c'\}$ contains an integral point (Hoffman & Kruskal, 1956).

By construction the matrix Q is a node-arc incidence matrix of a directed graph and it is known that node-arc incidence matrices are totally unimodular. As the polyhedron of (LP1) is bounded, every minimal face is an extreme point of the polyhedron, and thus all extreme points are integral. In particular all extreme points of (LP1) that maximize the objective are integral.

Now we analyze the properties of such an optimal extreme point δ^*. For that purpose we apply the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions (see e.g., Boyd & Vandenberghe (2004)) or equivalently dualize the problem and consider the complementarity conditions.

Let δ^* be integral and primal optimal to (LP1). Then there exist dual variables $\pi, \overline{\nu}$, and $\underline{\nu}$ that satisfy equations (7) to (10).

$$\forall i \in I \qquad -\sum_{t\in T} p_{i,t}Q_{i,t} + \sum_{t\in T} Q_{i,t}\pi_t + (\overline{\nu}_i - \underline{\nu}_i) = 0 \tag{7}$$

$$\forall i \in I \qquad \overline{\nu}_i, \underline{\nu}_i \geq 0 \tag{8}$$

$$\forall i \in I \qquad (\delta_i^* - \overline{\delta}_i)\overline{\nu}_i = 0 \tag{9}$$

$$\forall i \in I \qquad (-\delta_i^*)\underline{\nu}_i = 0 \tag{10}$$

Proposition 6. *The previous condition holds if and only if there exist prices π such that equations* (11) *and* (12) *hold.*

$$\forall i \in I \qquad \delta_i^* > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{t\in T}(p_{i,t} - \pi_t)Q_{i,t} \geq 0 \tag{11}$$

$$\forall i \in I \qquad \delta_i^* < \overline{\delta}_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{t\in T}(p_{i,t} - \pi_t)Q_{i,t} \leq 0 \tag{12}$$

These equations coincide with price conditions (2) and (3). This means that given an integral optimal solution δ^* to (LP1), there exist prices π such that the price conditions hold and (δ^*, π) is feasible for (MIP). Vice versa, a feasible solution for (MIP) is optimal for (LP1), as it satisfies the price condition and thereby maximizes the economic surplus of all participants.

Now we can characterize a feasible solution to (MIP) in the following way: Any integral point of (LP1) that maximizes the economic surplus is feasible to (MIP). As the polyhedron of (LP1) is integral, also the polyhedron of optimal solutions is integral. Hence, we can maximize the execution volume subject to the constraints of (MIP) by using a linear program where the economic surplus is fixed to its optimal value δ^* obtained from (LP1):

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i\in I}\delta_i && && \text{(LP2)}\\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \forall t \in T && \sum_{i\in I} Q_{i,t}\delta_i = 0 && \text{clearing constraint}\\
& \forall i \in I && \delta_i \leq \overline{\delta}_i && \text{quantity restriction}\\
& \forall i \in I && -\delta_i \leq 0 && \text{quantity restriction}\\
& && \sum_{i\in I}\delta_i \sum_{t\in T} p_{i,t}Q_{i,t} = \sum_{i\in I}\delta_i^* \sum_{t\in T} p_{i,t}Q_{i,t} && \text{optimality of economic surplus}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can construct an optimal solution to (MIP) by finding at first an optimal solution δ^* to the linear program (LP1). Then we solve (LP2) using δ^* as input to fix the economic surplus to the optimal value. An optimal extreme point of (LP2) is feasible and optimal to (MIP).

3.1. **Combining both hierarchy levels in one model.** In this section, we show that it is not necessary to solve the two LPs successively. Both LPs can be incorporated into just one LP. At first we describe an intuitive scaling technique based on an upper bound of the executed volume. Then we improve the scaling technique by using a smaller scaling factor which exploits the network flow structure of the model.

We know that each component of p and Q is integral. If a solution δ^* is integral, then the objective of (LP1) is also integral. The objective of (LP2) (volume maximization) is strictly bounded from above by $V := 1 + \sum_{i\in I}\overline{\delta}_i$. We define a new objective function that is given by V times the objective of (LP1) (surplus maximization) plus the objective function of (LP2):

$$\max \quad V\sum_{i\in I}\delta_i \sum_{t\in T} p_{i,t}Q_{i,t} + \sum_{i\in I}\delta_i. \tag{13}$$

Now we replace the objective in (LP1) by objective (13). An optimal solution to the resulting LP will be optimal to both (LP1) and (LP2). Thus, it is optimal to (MIP).

In practice the scaling factor V might be too large, causing numerical difficulties. We will now argue that we can choose a much smaller factor that is independent of the number of orders. This becomes evident from the following proposition.

Proposition 7 (Price rounding)**.** *(Müller, 2014, Prop. 1.12) Let $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $d, u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ totally unimodular with* $\operatorname{rank}(A) = m \geq 1$*, and $G > 2m\overline{d}$ with $\overline{d} = \max_i |d_i|$. If x^* and π^* are primal and dual optimal extreme points of*

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & Gc^\top x + d^\top x, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax = b, \qquad [\pi] \\ & 0 \leq x \leq u, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

then x^* and π' with $\pi'_i = \left\lfloor \pi^*_i / G + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ are primal and dual optimal extreme points of

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & c^\top x, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax = b, \qquad [\pi] \\ & 0 \leq x \leq u. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Note that in Proposition 7 we omit the dual variables of the lower and upper bounds, as we are only interested in the π-part of a dual solution. For this reason, we call π' *dual optimal*, if it is the π-part of a dual optimal solution including all dual variables, in particular those of the bounds.

Without loss of generality, let the rank of the constraint matrix of (LP1) amount to the number of contracts $|T|$. According to Proposition 7 we can use the scaling factor $G := 2|T| + 1$ in objective (13) instead of V. In futures opening auctions, G is typically much smaller than V, because the number of contracts (e.g., 4) is typically much smaller than the number of orders (e.g., 1500). For this reason, the scaling factor G causes less numerical problems than the scaling factor V.

Putting all together we obtain the linear program (LP3).

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{i \in I} \left(1 + G \sum_{t \in T} p_{i,t} Q_{i,t} \right) \delta_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & [\pi] \quad \forall t \in T \quad \sum_{i \in I} Q_{i,t} \delta_i = 0 \\ & \qquad \forall i \in I \quad 0 \leq \delta_i \leq \overline{\delta}_i \end{aligned} \tag{LP3}$$

An optimal primal solution to (LP3) provides us with the δ-part of an optimal solution to (MIP). In the next section, we present techniques for computing the π-part, the prices, of an optimal solution to (MIP).

3.2. **Market clearing prices and bid and ask prices.** We will now explain how market clearing prices and the bid-ask prices can be recovered. For the former we present two implicit methods, both arising from the special structure of optimal solutions.

Let δ^* be an optimal solution to (LP3). We want to compute prices π for all contracts such that all participants are completely satisfied, that is,

$$\forall i \in I \qquad \delta^*_i \in \operatorname*{argmax}_{\delta_i \in \{0, \ldots, \overline{\delta}_i\}} \left(\sum_{t \in T} p_{i,t} Q_{i,t} \delta_i - \sum_{t \in T} \pi_t Q_{i,t} \delta_i \right). \tag{16}$$

The prices π are called *market clearing prices* (MCP). They determine the amount of money a participant has to pay or receive for the execution of his or her order. The net amount of money to be paid or received is given by

$$-\sum_{t \in T} \pi_t Q_{i,t} \delta^*_i.$$

If this amount is positive one will receive money, otherwise one has to pay money. The most straightforward explicit method to compute market clearing prices π is to solve the δ^*-parameterized linear

feasibility problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall i \in I \quad \text{with} \quad \delta_i^* > 0 && \sum_{t \in T} (p_{i,t} - \pi_t) Q_{i,t} \geq 0, \\ &\forall i \in I \quad \text{with} \quad \delta_i^* < \overline{\delta}_i && \sum_{t \in T} (p_{i,t} - \pi_t) Q_{i,t} \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{LP4}$$

The model is motivated by the optimality conditions of (16), however comes at the cost of solving yet another linear program, which is undesirable. Instead, using Proposition 7, we can directly read-off the prices as follows: If π^* is the π-part of a dual optimal extreme point of (LP3) and $G > 2|T|$, then the market clearing prices π are given by

$$\pi_i = \left\lfloor \pi_t^* / G + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor \text{ for all } t \in T. \tag{17}$$

Such a dual optimal extreme point is a by-product of the simplex method if we use it for solving (LP3).

Alternatively, we can use the following theorem, which shows how the optimal base of (LP3) can be used to obtain market clearing prices. The theorem forms the basis for the proof of the previous proposition and provides a stronger result as its scaling factor is smaller.

Theorem 8 (Weighted objective theorem). *(Müller, 2014, Thm. 1.10) Let $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $d, u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ unimodular with* $\operatorname{rank}(A) = m$, *$b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $G > \overline{d}(1+m)$, where $\overline{d} = \max_i |d_i|$. If (B, N) is an optimal basis to* (14) *and x^* is an optimal solution to* (14), *then (x^*, π^*) with ${\pi^*}^\top = c_B^\top (A_{\cdot B})^{-1}$ is an optimal solution to*

$$\max \quad d^\top x \quad \text{s.t.} \quad x \textit{ maximizes } (15) \quad \textit{and} \quad \pi \textit{ minimizes the dual of } (15). \tag{18}$$

The scaling factor G is the smallest one in the following sense: if $G \leq \overline{d}(1+m)$, the theorem becomes false in general. As in Proposition 7 above, we omit the dual variables of lower and upper bounds.

If (B, N) is an optimal basis to (LP3) and $G > 1 + |T|$, then the market clearing prices π, which satisfy (16), are given by

$$\pi^\top = c_B^\top (A_{\cdot B})^{-1}, \tag{19}$$

where c is the objective vector of (LP1) and A is the constraint matrix of the clearing condition of (LP1). If we use the simplex method for solving (LP3), then the method computes the matrix $(A_{\cdot B})^{-1}$ in its final iteration and hence the required additional computation for the prices is simply a vector-matrix multiplication.

Finally, the *bid and ask prices* for each product are given by the limit prices of the best non-executed buy and sell orders of each product. The search for the best non-executed buy and sell orders can be done in linear time by iterating only once through all orders.

4. Numerical results

We will now present numerical results for various versions of our algorithms and compare them to previously employed algorithms.

4.1. **Algorithms and variants.**

In this section, we provide five different algorithms that are based on primal optimal and dual optimal extreme points of linear programs. The first two algorithms (Algorithms 1 and 2) solve the linear program (LP3) with the weighted objective and then apply Proposition 7 to compute market clearing prices via scaling and rounding the dual variables. The only difference is the scaling factor for combining the objective functions, $2|T|+1$ in the former and the naive one in latter case; we will see that the size of the scaling factor influences the computing times. Note that we could also compute the prices using a primal dual optimal basis as described in (19) (see also Alg. 1.3.1 in Müller (2014)). This method might slightly outperform price rounding as it uses a smaller scaling factor ($|T| + 2$ versus $2|T| + 1$), however the actual price computation is slightly more expensive: matrix-vector multiplication versus rounding. Regardless, both scaling factors have the same order of magnitude $O(|T|)$ and we expect that their running times also have

the same order of magnitude. We will only focus on price rounding in this comparison, due to its simplicity.

Algorithm 3 solves two LPs successively: it solves (LP1) first to compute market clearing prices and reduced costs. Then it fixes all variables with positive reduced costs to the upper bound, and variables with negative reduced costs to the lower bound. The remaining free variables are used to maximize the execution volume; see (Müller, 2014, Section 1.4) for a discussion of this approach.

Algorithm 4 also solves two LPs successively: it solves (LP1) first to compute the market clearing prices and then (LP2) to maximize the executed volume subject to the maximized economic surplus of the first LP.

Finally, Algorithm 5 represents our initial approach proposed in (Winter, Müller, Martin, Pape, Peter & Pokutta, 2014): it scales the objective with the naive scaling factor, solves (LP3), and then recovers the prices using (LP4).

Algorithm 1 weighted objective, see (Müller, 2014, Alg. 1.3.2)

$G \leftarrow 2|T| + 1$
$(\delta^*, \pi^*) \leftarrow$ Compute a pair of primal and dual optimal extreme points of (LP3).
for $t \in T$ **do** $\pi'_t \leftarrow \left\lfloor \pi^*_t / G + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$
Return (δ^*, π').

Algorithm 2 naive weighted objective

$G \leftarrow 1 + \sum_{i \in I} \overline{\delta}_i$
$(\delta^*, \pi^*) \leftarrow$ Compute a pair of primal and dual optimal extreme points of (LP3).
for $t \in T$ **do** $\pi'_t \leftarrow \left\lfloor \pi^*_t / G + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$
// Warning: Scaling and rounding of π^* is only correct if $G > 2|T|$.
Return (δ^*, π').

Algorithm 3 reduced costs, see (Müller, 2014, Alg. 1.4.1)

$(\pi^*, \overline{\nu}^*, \underline{\nu}^*) \leftarrow$ Compute a dual optimal extreme point of (LP1).
$P \leftarrow \{i \in I \mid (\overline{\nu}^*_i - \underline{\nu}^*_i) > 0\}$
$Z \leftarrow \{i \in I \mid (\overline{\nu}^*_i - \underline{\nu}^*_i) = 0\}$
$N \leftarrow \{i \in I \mid (\overline{\nu}^*_i - \underline{\nu}^*_i) < 0\}$
$\delta^*_P \leftarrow \overline{\delta}_P$ *// Fix variables with positive reduced costs to upper bound.*
$\delta^*_N \leftarrow 0$ *// Fix variables with negative reduced costs to lower bound.*
$\delta^*_Z \leftarrow$ Compute a primal optimal extreme point of

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{i \in Z} \delta_i \mid \sum_{i \in Z} Q_i \delta_i = -\sum_{i \in P} Q_i \overline{\delta}_i,\ 0 \le \delta_Z \le \overline{\delta}_Z \right\}.$$

Return (δ^*, π^*).

Algorithm 4 fixed objective

$(\delta', \pi^*) \leftarrow$ Compute a pair of primal and dual optimal extreme points of (LP1).
$\delta^* \leftarrow$ Compute a primal optimal extreme point of (LP2) using δ' as input.
Return (δ^*, π^*).

Algorithm 5 explicit prices

$G \leftarrow 1 + \sum_{i \in I} \overline{\delta}_i$
$\delta^* \leftarrow$ Compute a primal optimal extreme point of (LP3).
$\pi^* \leftarrow$ Compute a primal optimal extreme point of (LP4) using δ^* as input.
Return (δ^*, π^*).

In the following we will provide numerical results for the previously introduced algorithms.

4.2. **Comparison of Algorithm 1 using varying subroutines.** In each algorithm up to two linear programs need to be solved by a subroutine. In Algorithm 1, for instance, the subproblem (LP3) must be solved. In general, we can use the simplex method for solving these subproblems. In the case of (LP3), we can also use special purpose solvers as it is a min cost flow problem. The chosen subroutine for solving the LPs can have a huge impact on the overall running time.

We will now compare the running time of four different variants of Algorithm 1 using four different subroutines for solving (LP3). For this purpose, we solved 3000 random instances, each having 20 contracts and up to 10,000 orders. Note that (LP3) is a min cost flow problem with a large number of parallel arcs and a small number of nodes. Ahuja *et al.* propose to solve such problems with algorithms which handle the parallel arcs implicitly (Ahuja et al., 1993, Chapter 14.4 and 14.5) and the authors describe such a polynomial time algorithm. In order to be able to apply this algorithm to (LP3), one must transform it into a convex cost flow problem with separable piecewise linear cost functions, which can be done in polynomial time.

For our comparison here we will focus on utilizing available state-of-the-art software libraries. We compare the *Lemon network simplex* and the *Lemon cost scaling* algorithm (both from *COIN-OR Lemon Graph Library* (Lemon, 2014)) with *CPLEX's network simplex* and *Gurobi's dual simplex*; Gurobi and CPLEX are the leading mixed-integer programming solvers. The *COIN-OR Lemon Graph Library* (Lemon, 2014) provides several efficient implementations of min cost flow algorithms (Király & Kovács, 2012), for instance, the network simplex and the cost-scaling algorithm of Goldberg and Tarjan (Bünnagel et al., 1998).

The two graphs in Figure 1 display the average computing time[1] for instances with 20 contracts/nodes and a varying number of orders/parallel arcs. Each data point represents the average computing time of 50 random-instances. The instances are solved as follows: At first we load the raw instance parameters into the memory (RAM). Then, in the *model creation phase*, we create and load an instance of (LP3) with scaling factor $G := 2|T| + 1$ into the memory of the respective solver via its application programming interface (API). Next, in the *raw computing phase*, we call the solver routine that starts the computations, we import the results via the API, and finally compute the prices as described in equation (17).

Figure 1 shows that in our test cases, the Lemon network simplex clearly outperforms the other three algorithms. For example, its average computing time for instances with 1000 orders amounts to only 678 µs, whereas Gurobi's dual simplex requires 3168 µs; on average, instances with 10 000 orders are solved in 9.3 ms, whereas Gurobi requires 28.5 ms. The long total computing times of Gurobi are basically due to the fact that the creation of the LP model requires a lot of time. In contrast to Gurobi, CPLEX provides a network API that allows for a fast model creation. Due to this fast API, the CPLEX network simplex easily outperforms Gurobi's dual simplex. Nevertheless, the Lemon cost scaling is still slightly faster than the CPLEX network simplex. We would like to stress, though, that the cost scaling algorithm is actually not a valid subroutine for Algorithm 1, as it provides arbitrary optimal solutions and does not provide the required optimal extreme points. We included this algorithm mainly for the sake of comparison.

Apart from the significantly shorter computing times, the Lemon network simplex has further advantages in comparison to CPLEX and Gurobi: as it is open source the source code can be readily modified. Moreover, it uses exact arithmetic without any numerical errors, whereas CPLEX and

[1] C++ program running on a *Core i7-920, 6GB-DDR3, 64Bit Linux* using *Lemon 1.3*, *CPLEX 12.6.* Network C API, and *Gurobi 5.6.3* without presolving.



FIGURE 1. Computing times for 3000 random instances with 20 contracts/nodes and a varying number of orders/arcs. The wide bars represent the *model creation times*. The thick marked upper borders of these bars represent the *total computing times* and the thin marked lower borders represent the *raw computing times*.

Gurobi use floating point operations, which are exposed to small numerical errors. These numerical errors though are of secondary importance as they can be safely ignored: due to optimal solutions being integral, rounding a flawed fractional basic solution yields the correct integral basic solution.

4.3. **Comparison of Algorithms 1 to 5 on real world instances.** We will now compare the running times of Algorithms 1 to 5. For each algorithm we present numerical results of the algorithm variant that uses the *CPLEX network simplex* as a subroutine. In this test, we solved 40 real world instances with each algorithm. The instances were generated from historical order books of EUREX and were initially studied by Winter et al. (2011). The proposed solution approach therein is an integer programming model[2] solving the futures opening auction problem. For completeness, we would like to mention that the original data set has 55 instances, however only for 40 instances the order books could be fully reconstructed, which is necessary for a comparison.

[2] ZIMPL model running on a *Pentium 4, 3.06GHz, 512MB, Windows XP SP3* using *SCIP 1.1.0*.

In the previous section, we used different standard solvers as subroutines for Algorithm 1 (*weighted objective*) and observed that the Lemon network simplex outperformed the other subroutines. However, in this section, two of the algorithms require an LP solver as subroutine. For this reason, we decided to use the CPLEX network simplex for our comparisons[3].



Figure 2. Comparison of five different algorithms.

Figure 2 shows the computing times of Algorithm 1 to 5. The figure suggests that the computing time is roughly linear in the number of orders, which is also consistent with the results in Section 4.2. Furthermore, we can see that Algorithm 4 (*fixed objective*) is the slowest one. The second slowest algorithm is Algorithm 5 (*explicit prices*) as its price computation via (LP4) is very time consuming. The computing times of the other three algorithms are the shortest ones and are more or less similar.

Table 1 presents the average computing times of the five algorithms and the one of Winter et al. (2011). Note that the computing times of Winter et al. (2011) are not directly comparable as the computations where performed on a slower machine and with a different solver. However, the table shows that this method is the slowest one by a huge margin so that the difference in hard- and software is negligible. The fastest method is Algorithm 1 (*weighted objective*). Its average computing time amounts to only 2966 µs. Furthermore, we see that Algorithm 3 (*reduced costs*) is an admissible alternative to Algorithm 1. With an average computing time of 3474 µs it is only slightly slower but numerically more robust than Algorithm 1, as it does not scale the objective.

Furthermore, we can observe that the running time of the CPLEX network simplex depends on the size of the scaling factor: the smaller the factor, the shorter the running time (see Table 1). The polynomial network simplex variant of Orlin (1997) behaves in a qualitatively similar way. It runs in

$$O\left(\min\{|T|^2|I|\log|T|C,\ |T|^2|I|^2\log|T|\}\right)$$

time, where C is the largest absolute objective coefficient.

[3] Java program running on a *Core i7-920, 6GB-DDR3, 64Bit Linux* using *CPLEX 12.4* and *OpenJDK IcedTea6 1.12.6*.

Table 1. Computing times for 40 real instances

computing time in µs (average of 10 runs per instance)							
		weighted objective 1 LP	*naive weighted obj. 1 LP*	*reduced costs 2 LPs*	*fixed objective 2 LPs*	*explicit prices 2 LPs*	
#	*bids*	*Alg. 1*	*Alg. 2*	*Alg. 3*	*Alg. 4*	*Alg. 5*	*IP Model (Winter et al., 2011)*
1	246	937	931	1120	1464	1947	270000
2	300	1115	1095	1307	1729	2121	80000
3	324	1037	1060	1231	1666	2112	70000
4	334	1161	1101	1629	1841	2157	750000
5	336	1170	1106	1386	1947	2140	970000
6	342	1102	1139	1290	1757	2251	90000
7	361	1184	1148	1449	1909	2273	530000
8	393	1192	1180	1387	1880	2167	500000
9	443	1186	1193	1387	1904	2360	210000
10	445	1511	1442	1894	2305	2520	340000
11	478	1821	1744	2056	2621	2477	120000
12	491	1473	1512	1661	2488	2786	140000
13	496	1807	1736	2227	2956	2829	250000
14	505	1355	1364	1555	2137	2468	110000
15	516	1441	1437	1871	2322	2665	630000
16	518	1695	1637	2215	2690	2608	700000
17	555	1774	1809	2076	2645	2327	130000
18	614	1747	1685	1941	2997	2871	220000
19	701	2277	2303	2640	3530	3769	80000
20	787	2454	2643	3117	4336	4071	480000
21	794	2363	2457	2821	3705	3360	110000
22	833	2132	2063	2943	3885	3399	110000
23	917	2155	2113	2416	3934	3307	8220000
24	2023	4354	4105	4906	7404	5340	30000
25	2190	4470	5089	5066	9720	7328	90000
26	2361	3828	4154	5345	8046	5957	100000
27	2424	3925	3869	4112	7788	6557	1270000
28	2502	4271	5907	4612	11424	7782	110000
29	2530	5180	5250	6536	11706	7710	220000
30	2537	3787	4089	4311	10686	6083	120000
31	2663	4244	4522	4806	12753	6650	5330000
32	2767	4286	4947	4656	11623	7130	450000
33	2812	3877	3853	4358	8922	5678	50000
34	2906	4446	4449	4734	10205	6465	150000
35	3074	4693	6626	5067	16617	8976	11970000
36	3616	6072	6431	7611	15096	8746	1200000
37	3683	7731	8211	9356	16172	10004	350000
38	3684	4764	4960	5172	13393	7731	40000
39	3751	7156	7785	8831	16996	10173	70000
40	4298	5458	6829	5844	16254	10701	70000
avg.	*1539*	*2966*	*3174*	*3474*	*6586*	*4750*	*918250*

5. Summary

We introduced several new methods for solving the futures opening auction problem. We showed that the problem can be modeled as a min cost flow problem with two hierarchical objectives. The primary objective is the surplus maximization and the secondary one is the volume maximization. This kind of problem can be solved efficiently by exploiting the properties of extreme point solutions, as it is done in Proposition 7 and Theorem 8. The resulting algorithm is very simple as it just computes a pair of primal dual optimal extreme points of a min cost flow problem with a weighted

objective and then scales and rounds the dual solution. However, it is not only the simplest algorithm but also turned out to be the fastest one in our numerical tests. Furthermore, due to its short computing time it is well suited for real world applications.

Acknowledgements

We want to thank M. Rudel for providing us insight into his research results and for providing us with his test data that enabled us to quickly verify our model. We also would like to thank Deutsche Börse AG and H. Schäfer for supporting our work and D. Weninger for the helpful discussions.

References

Ahuja, R. K., Magnanti, T. L., & Orlin, J. B. (1993). *Network flows*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc. Theory, algorithms, and applications.

Arrow, K. J., & Debreu, G. (1954). Existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, *22*, 265–290.

Boyd, S., & Vandenberghe, L. (2004). *Convex optimization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bünnagel, U., Korte, B., & Vygen, J. (1998). Efficient implementation of the Goldberg-Tarjan minimum-cost flow algorithm. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, *10*, 157–174. doi:10.1080/10556789808805709.

Cooper, C. L. (2015). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Management* volume IV Finance. Online Reference: Rollover Risk. Blackwell Publishing. URL: http://www.blackwellreference.com/public/book.html?id=g9780631233176_9780631233176.

de Vries, S., & Vohra, R. V. (2003). Combinatorial auctions: a survey. *INFORMS J. Comput.*, *15*, 284–309. doi:10.1287/ijoc.15.3.284.16077.

Hoffman, A. J., & Kruskal, J. B. (1956). Integral boundary points of convex polyhedra. In *Linear inequalities and related systems* Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 38 (pp. 223–246). Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.

Hull, J. C. (2006). *Options, Futures, and other Derivatives*. (Sixth ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Király, Z., & Kovács, P. (2012). Efficient implementations of minimum-cost flow algorithms. *Acta Univ. Sapientiae, Informatica*, *4*, 67–118. arXiv:1207.6381.

Lemon (2014). Library for Efficient Modeling and Optimization in Networks. Version: 1.3. URL: http://lemon.cs.elte.hu.

Martin, A., Müller, J. C., & Pokutta, S. (2014). Strict linear prices in non-convex European day-ahead electricity markets. *Optim. Methods Softw.*, *29*, 189–221. doi:10.1080/10556788.2013.823544. arXiv:1203.4177.

Mas-Colell, A., Whinston, M. D., & Green, J. R. (1995). *Microeconomic Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Müller, J. C. (2014). *Auctions in Exchange Trading Systems: Modeling Techniques and Algorithms*. Ph.D. thesis University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. doi:10.13140/2.1.1621.8405 urn:nbn:de:bvb:29-opus4-53396.

Orlin, J. B. (1997). A polynomial time primal network simplex algorithm for minimum cost flows. *Math. Programming*, *78*, 109–129. doi:10.1007/BF02614365. Network optimization: algorithms and applications (San Miniato, 1993).

Winter, T., Müller, J. C., Martin, A., Pape, S., Peter, A., & Pokutta, S. (2014). Method and system for performing an opening auction of a derivative. URL: http://www.google.com/patents/US20140372275 Pub. No.: US 2014/0372275 A1. US Patent App. 13/920,041.

Winter, T., Rudel, M., Lalla, H., Brendgen, S., Geißler, B., Martin, A., & Morsi, A. (2011). System and method for performing an opening auction of a derivative. URL: https://www.google.de/patents/US20110119170 Pub. No.: US 2011/0119170 A1. US Patent App. 12/618,410.